

REMARKS

Applicants have carefully reviewed the Application in light of the Office Action dated March 8, 2006. Claims 1-46 are pending and stand rejected. Applicants have amended claim 26. Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter has been added by these amendments. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

Section 102 Rejections

The Examiner rejects claims 26, 27, 29, 30, 42, 43, 44 and 45 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by *Logan et al.* (U.S. Pat. No. 5,781,909). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reasons discussed below.

Applicants submit that *Logan et al.* fails to teach each and every limitation of the claimed invention. For example, amended independent claim 26 recites, "receiving a rotation set comprising a list identifying pages to be displayed in a predetermined sequence." In contrast, *Logan et al.* merely teaches processing locally stored files to determine if the included data has been updated remotely. ABSTRACT. In particular, *Logan et al.* discloses a validation means that compares several parameters of locally stored files against remotely stored files to determine whether the locally stored files need to be updated. Col. 2, Lines 15-23. Thus, *Logan et al.* fails to teach or suggest a list identifying pages to be displayed in a predetermined sequence. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 26 and its dependents are allowable.

Independent claim 42 recites limitations that are similar, although not identical, to the limitation of claim 26 discussed above. Therefore, this claim is allowable for reasons analogous to those discussed above in connection with claim 26. Claims 43-46 each depend from independent claim 42 and are thus also patentable over the cited art.

The Examiner rejects claims 31, 32 and 39 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by *Lefeber et al.* (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2002/0046299). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reasons discussed below.

Applicants submit that *Lefebber et al.* fails to teach each and every limitation of the claimed invention. For example, amended independent claim 31 recites, "respond to a change in the stored data to be displayed by identifying at least one client displaying previously stored data and notifying the at least one client of the change in the stored data." More particularly, claim 31 recites, "identifying at least one client displaying previously stored data." In contrast, *Lefebber et al.* merely teaches transmitting a notification to someone in response to an event. ABSTRACT. In particular, *Lefebber et al.* teaches that alert rules that indicate when a user should be alerted to a real-time event are stored in database 103. [0033]. Once filtering server 112a determines such an event has occurred, the server 112a instructs signaling server 102 to transmit a notification to the user. [0034]. Applicants were unable to identify any section cited by the Examiner that teaches or suggest identifying at least one client displaying previously stored data. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 31 and its dependents are allowable.

Section 103 Rejections

The Examiner rejects claims 1, 16, 17, 24 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Lefebber et al.* in further view of *Smith et al.* (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2002/0016839). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reasons discussed below. Independent claim 1 recites limitations that are similar, although not identical, to the limitation of claim 31 discussed above. The Office Action fails to cite any teachings in *Smith et al.* for the missing limitations. Therefore, claim 1 is allowable for reasons analogous to those discussed above in connection with claim 31. Claims 16, 17, 24 and 25 each depend from independent claim 31 and are thus also patentable over the cited art.

The Examiner rejects claims 2-11, and 19 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Lefebber et al.* and *Smith et al.* in further view of *Logan et al.* The

Examiner rejects claims 12 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Lefeber et al.*, *Smith et al.*, and *Logan et al.* in further view of *Ballard* (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. US 2004/0039776) and *Hanson et al.* (U.S. Pat. No. 6,985,950). The Examiner rejects claims 14 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Lefeber et al.*, *Smith et al.*, and *Logan et al.*, in further view of *Stone et al.* (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2002/0078134). The Examiner rejects claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Lefeber et al.*, and *Smith et al.*, in further view of *Ballard* and *Hanson et al.* (U.S. Pat. No. 6,985,840). The Examiner rejects claims 21 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Lefeber et al.*, and *Smith et al.* in further view of *Ballard*. The Examiner rejects claim 22 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Lefeber et al.*, and *Smith et al.* in further view of *Ballard* and *Logan et al.* The Examiner rejects claims 28 and 46 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Logan et al.* in further view of *Stone et al.* The Examiner rejects claims 33, 34, 35 and 36 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Lefeber et al.*, in further view of *Su et al.* (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2003/0084124) and *Logan et al.* The Examiner rejects claim 37 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Lefeber et al.* in further view of *Scheinkman* (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2003/0005129). The Examiner rejects claims 38 and 41 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Lefeber et al.* in further view of *SearchSecurity* (SearchSecurity.com, pages 1-3, published October 5, 2000). The Examiner rejects claim 40 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Lefeber et al.* in further view of *Ballard*. As discussed above, independent claims 1 and 31 are allowable over *Lefeber et al.* and claims 26 and 42 are allowable over *Logan et al.*. The Office Action fails to cite any teaching or suggestion in the additional cited are of the missing elements discussed above. Therefore, claims 2-11, 14, 15, 18, 19 , 21-23, 28, 33-37, 40, 41, and 46 are allowable at least because they depend from one of allowable Claims 1, 26, 31 and 42. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Applicants have now made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons, and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicants respectfully request full allowance of all Claims.


If the present application is not allowed and/or if one or more of the rejections is maintained, Applicants hereby request a telephone conference with the Examiner and further request that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney to schedule the telephone conference.

No fees are believed to be due. However, please apply any deficiencies or any other required fees or any credits to deposit account 05-0765, referencing the attorney docket number shown above.

Date: _____

June 8, 2007

Respectfully submitted,



Michael E. Cox
Reg. No. 47,505

PTO CUSTOMER NO. 26230
Fish & Richardson P.C.
1717 Main Street
Suite 5000
Dallas, Texas 75201
Telephone: (214) 760-6107
Facsimile: (214) 747-2091